

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES ACT OF 1997

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1997

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce with my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997. This bipartisan legislation represents a new effort in Congress to rechannel existing Federal drug control resources into support for locally-based, community anti-drug efforts that are working to reduce teenage drug abuse around the country. Now is clearly the time for action on this issue.

Tragically, after more than a decade of substantial progress in reducing drug abuse in America from 1979 to 1991, the trends have now reversed. Marijuana use alone has tripled among 8th graders and more than doubled among 10th and 12th graders; significantly, daily use has increased dramatically during this period so that today, one in 20 of today's high school seniors use marijuana daily. And, the marijuana of today—because of the chemical THC content—is up to 15 times stronger than the marijuana of the 1970's. Use of cocaine, crack cocaine, amphetamine stimulants, barbiturates and heroin among teenagers are all on the rise. LSD use is at its highest recorded level.

These statistics from the University of Michigan's Monitoring the Future Study are quite troubling, but the anecdotal evidence in the field—the real human stories about drug use and the impact it has on the lives of our young people—is even more compelling and brings home to each one of us the need to do something very tangible that can help address this problem, community by community.

A courageous woman from my district, Patty Gilbert, came to Washington, D.C. to tell me about the tragic story of her 16-year-old son, Jeff Gardner. Jeff combined smoking marijuana with huffing gasoline one day and lost his life. A whole future gone because of a lack of understanding of the real risks of drug use. Twenty-one high school students were expelled from a public school in my district for LSD, cocaine and marijuana use. The stories of death and lost opportunities go on and on. And such stories are common today in every area of the country.

If we are going to design sensible public policies, we have to understand what is driving increases in drug abuse among our young people. It is a complicated issue and there are no silver bullets. Two key factors seem to directly correlate with increases in drug use. When kids view drug use as socially acceptable—when peer norms are soft—drug use rises. When our young people view drug use as less dangerous, again, drug use rises. So, basically, this problem comes down to a prob-

lem of eroding attitudes about the acceptability and risks associated with drug abuse.

The good news is that we are not powerless to solve this problem. We have done it before as a Nation and we can do it again. The key question in my mind, however, is how do we do this over the long haul, and bring some national leadership where it ultimately has to be on this problem—at the community, neighborhood and family levels.

The Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997 is designed to do just that and to do it in a smart, cost-efficient fashion. This bipartisan legislation is built on the belief that the local community commitment is absolutely essential to solving the drug problem, year in and year out. It recognizes that community venture capital and major sector involvement are the keys to solving our Nation's drug problem. In order to receive a Federal matching grant under this program, communities must first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reducing substance abuse. Experience in the field, good research and common sense tell us that communities that have every major sector involved in implementing strategies to reduce drug abuse are the most effective. That is why this legislation supports those communities that have mobilized youth, parents, businesses, faith leaders, law enforcement, educators and other key sectors and have been working together for at least 6 months with a focused mission and targeted strategies.

The local community must also demonstrate that there is substantial local will to address the substance abuse problems in that community. Without that local will, no program can survive over the long-run. In fact, one of my concerns with the CSAP Community Partnership Program is that grants were given to communities that did not always have strong non-Federal financial and other support. During its 6-year life, the CSAP Community Partnership Program has made at least 252 grants, typically ranging from \$350,000 to \$700,000, to local community programs; today, we understand that only 137 of these programs survive. It seems to me that the Federal Government should be providing important early support to communities that will continue to sustain the effort with our without the Federal Government.

Another key aspect of the Drug-Free Communities Act is that it requires the local coalition or effort to have a system of evaluation in place. One of the criticisms of Federal programs that support State and local initiatives has been that such programs lack any accountability. Instead of trying to measure outcomes and do evaluations at the Federal level, which would require a large bureaucracy and would not necessarily produce any better results, the onus is on the local coalition to put in place a system that measures its progress—including outcomes, such as whether teenage drug abuse is declining—over time. It is our experience that those efforts around the country that are making a difference already have good systems of evaluation in

place. They have to have such systems in order to justify their continued existence. The question is how such efforts can add value and a system of performance measures is critical to determining that.

The Federal support provided under this program redirects, at its height, less than three-tenths of 1 percent of existing money from the \$16 billion Federal drug control budget to support, dollar for dollar up to \$100,000 per community, local community efforts. This is another check to ensure that there is local will. Not one Federal dollar will be spent under this program without a dollar or more generated by the local community.

Talking to community coalitions and groups around the country that are successfully implementing strategies to combat teenage drug abuse shores up the need for the Federal Government to provide incremental support. A few examples.

Ronda Kopelke from the North Woods Coalition in Marshfield, WI, wrote: "If you have Federal support based on community buy-in, then it can help us leverage support from the community. A small grant from the Federal Government—even \$5,000—could enable our coalition to build a regional youth alliance, send youth to camp to learn drug and alcohol strategies and to hire a part-time person to marshal the volunteers necessary to sustain the effort over time."

Marilyn Culp, executive director of the highly successful Miami Coalition covering 1.8 million people in Miami, FL, said that a \$100,000 grant from the Federal Government would enable the coalition to leverage an additional \$300,000–\$400,000 from the private sector, expanding the effort to train parents, to communicate drug-free messages on billboards, and to enhance the many other activities that have made the Miami Coalition so effective. Ms. Culp also reports that under the current CSAP grant program the Federal reporting requirements are so cumbersome, that she had to hire a person just to comply with those requirements. Coalition leaders around the country have echoed this concern.

Don Lynch of the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribes in the State of Washington is trying to develop a comprehensive adolescent treatment program. While there is substantial volunteer participation in the effort—in fact, one of the program's mottoes is "chi-e-che", which means "helper"—some small support from the Federal Government will enable the hiring of a full-time adolescent counselor and additional private support can be leveraged to sustain the effort over time.

Karen Hoff, Director of the Clean Focus Coalition in Charles Town, WV, is implementing a peer mediation program which helps kids resist peer pressure to take drugs and teaches them life-enhancing decision-making skills. This program could be fully up and running with \$3,000. With \$2,000 from the Federal Government, a locally supported parent education program could be expanded to reach 1,000 parents in the Charles Town area.

The stories go on and on, but the point is that a small amount of Federal support that

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

tracks strong local will can help local communities have a greater impact in their own regions.

To ensure that this program maintains the sophistication to give support only to those efforts that are truly working, while maintaining the flexibility to permit communities to continue to fashion local solutions, an advisory commission or board of trustees is charged with helping to select the administrator and to overseeing the program. Local community leaders and experts at the national and State levels in the field of substance abuse prevention and treatment will be able to review grant applications, and policies and criteria relating to the program. Those who are working directly in the field—on the front lines of the drug problem—will be able to offer valuable input to those administering the program.

The Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997 is our effort to redirect Federal drug control policy to help support local communities. We believe it is fully consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy, which includes as part of its No. 1 goal, support of community anti-drug coalition efforts. We look forward to working with our colleagues on a bipartisan basis and with the administration to help communities throughout our country reduce substance abuse.

PAYOFFS FOR LAYOFFS CORPORATE WELFARE ELIMINATION ACT OF 1997

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1997

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing bipartisan legislation in conjunction with my colleague, Mr. SANDERS of Vermont, to end a wasteful corporate welfare policy which uses taxpayer money to subsidize defense contractor mergers. This legislation—the Payoffs for Layoffs Corporate Welfare Elimination Act of 1997—will put a stop to the practice of artificially stimulating layoffs with taxpayer funds.

As some of you know, under the guise of an obscure Clinton administration policy change made in July 1993—at the specific request of four CEOs representing America's top defense contractors—DOD began to allow defense contractors to begin charging the taxpayers for the merger-related costs of laying off workers and shutting down plants. The premise behind this policy is as dubious now as it was back then: that unless Uncle Sam dishes out big corporate subsidies, defense contractors would rather remain uncompetitive and risk going out of business than use their own money to pay for mergers and restructuring.

Already, 11 defense contractors have put in 17 requests totaling \$817.3 million, and the meter is running. Lockheed Martin alone could eventually claim \$1.2 billion in merger subsidies, according to statements by their CEO, Norman Augustine. When the Loral, McDonnell Douglas, Rockwell International, Texas Instruments, and Hughes merger subsidy requests come in, this total will skyrocket into the billions.

DOD claims that by paying more money on contracts now, DOD will realize savings due to

lower overhead at some unspecified time in the future. This justification is really nothing more than an updated and more sophisticated version of the old cartoon character adage of "I'll gladly pay you on Tuesday for a hamburger today."

The fact of the matter is that claims of savings are greatly exaggerated. Indeed, the very concept of savings assumes the contractor will put off or delay restructuring unless they are given subsidies. In December 1996, an investigation by CBS's 60 Minutes correctly pointed out that, "Even without the subsidy, defense companies are required by law to pass savings back to the Government when they reduce their overhead."

My legislation does not hinder or prevent mergers from happening. It simply states that mergers should happen on their own and without DOD prompting and use of our tax dollars. I concur with the Honorable Don Yockey, who was Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology during the Bush administration, when he stated "the defense department would be better served if they simply did not discourage acquisition, but stayed at arms length in the encouragement of the business financial process. If the deal does not make sound stand alone business sense the company should not proceed. To rely on Government-subsidized support is the worst of reasons to merge."

While we must always be concerned when government subsidies warps business decisions, equally disturbing is the fact that the so-called savings to be realized from restructuring have thus far been mostly illusory. Not a single weapon system can be truly identified as having a lower cost due primarily to corporate restructuring. The fact of the matter is that DOD's very own report on restructuring stated: "it is not feasible to isolate completely the effect of restructuring from other complex determinants of the difference between projected and actual costs over a long period of time." In plain English, DOD essentially admits that savings cannot be attributed to restructuring.

What we really have here is a policy with unknowable assumptions and unverifiable effects. GAO found that in just one case, contractor estimates of savings fell 85 percent short of initial claims. And that is just the estimates—there is no way of knowing if there will ever be real savings. GAO also has stated on more than one occasion that contractors have been projecting future increases—not decreases—in overhead rates.

While savings cannot be attributed directly to these subsidies, additional layoffs have unquestionably resulted from the policy. In the first merger analyzed by GAO, it found that "the contractor's proposed savings were based entirely on work force reductions."

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues—on all sides of the aisle—to join with me to put a stop to this payoffs for layoffs policy. Not only is this policy not really saving any money, it actually increases the deficit because DOD is spending hundreds of millions of our tax dollars chasing after savings to which it is entitled to receive anyway. This type of corporate welfare is unconscionable and Members with defense contractors in their districts should be especially wary of it. In my district alone, over 3,200 jobs will be lost because of this policy. If you have a plant in your district, you should not have to worry about your own tax dollars being used to encourage it to shut down.

NO PACIFIC NUCLEAR DUMP

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, when most of us think of Pacific islands, we usually think of a tropical paradise with brightly colored fish swimming in turquoise waters while palm fronds rustle overhead in a warm gentle breeze. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you that there is trouble in paradise because there are some people that see a tropical island and think of nuclear dump sites.

As we struggle with the legacy of the cold war and the wastes generated by it, those that trade in these wastes have increasingly looked at isolated atolls, with few if any constituents to object, as likely nuclear dump sites. Several years ago, there was a proposal to store radioactive waste in the Marshall Islands. Fortunately, the Marshallese Government eventually thought better of it and that proposal died. Last year, a group calling itself U.S. Nuclear Fuels was making the rounds in Washington, DC, to drum up support for a proposal to create a nuclear dump site on Palmyra Island, a private owned island in U.S. territory. This proposal prompted the introduction of legislation in both Houses of Congress prohibiting the Federal Government from siting a nuclear waste storage facility outside the 50 States. Now, another group, Nuclear Disarmament Services, Inc., is circulating legislation to authorize the siting of a nuclear dump site on either Palmyra or Wake Island, a U.S. possession. In fact, there is a symposium occurring today at Georgetown University, sponsored by U.S. Nuclear Fuels, to discuss this proposal.

What do all these crazy ideas have in common? One man, Alex Copeson, has been the driving force behind all these proposals and a principal in these companies. And this is not Mr. Copeson's first foray into the waste trade. In the early 1990's, he was the pitch man for a scheme to dump toxic waste on the sea floor, even though this is prohibited under U.S. and international law.

Why does Mr. Copeson think that we should store nuclear waste on Pacific islands? An article in the March edition of Outside magazine offers some insights. Referring to the Marshallese Government and the Bikini Islanders, Mr. Copeson is quoted as saying, "They're all scam artists banging the tin cup in front of the white man. They'd open a whorehouse and sell their daughters and grandmothers for a dollar. They've never lived so good since that bomb, the fat lazy [expletive]. All they want to do is go gambling, drinking, and whoring in the United States. The only contribution they could make to the world is to give someone their islands [for waste] and take a hike—be an absentee landlord for world peace."

Given Mr. Copeson's views of the people of the tropical Pacific and his insensitivity to the economic, social, and environmental injuries inflicted on them by above-ground nuclear testing, it is no wonder that he thinks that we should continue to dump radioactivity in their back yard. And that brings up the most crucial point. Even if one thought that shipping nuclear waste thousands of miles across the stormy Pacific Ocean to store it on geologically unstable coral or volcanic islands in the